VZCZCXRO6164
RR RUEHDBU RUEHIK RUEHLN RUEHPOD RUEHSK RUEHVK RUEHYG
DE RUEHMO #0501/01 0610436
ZNR UUUUU ZZH
R 020436Z MAR 09
FM AMEMBASSY MOSCOW
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC 2183
INFO RHEHNSC/NSC WASHDC
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHDC
RUEHGV/USMISSION GENEVA 5279
RUEHUNV/USMISSION UNVIE VIENNA 0547
RUCNCIS/CIS COLLECTIVE
RUEHXD/MOSCOW POLITICAL COLLECTIVE
RUEHZG/NATO EU COLLECTIVE

UNCLAS SECTION 01 OF 02 MOSCOW 000501

SENSITIVE SIPDIS

E.O. 12958: N/A

TAGS: PARM PREL AORC KPAO PTER UNSC

SUBJECT: FOLLOW-UP TO UNSCR 1540 PROGRAM OF WORK DEMARCHE

REF: A. STATE 10774

¶B. USG EDITS TO DRAFT POW

11. (SBU) Summary: On February 26 we followed up ref A demarche to MFA DVBR Export Control Section Chief Aleksandr Deyneko, who told us the GOR's main priority for the 1540 Committee was to conduct a comprehensive review of the Committee's work. He said Russia was prepared to accept almost all of the USG-proposed revisions to the Program of Work (POW), with the exception of Section 6, which deal with the POW's implementation. The GOR broke silence on February 20 because it did not have enough time to respond to the U.S. proposals in detail and believed the proposal to establish new working groups should be considered during the Comprehensive Review. Deyneko told us the GOR detected some overlapping responsibilities among the proposed working groups, and proposed combining the three proposed working groups that deal with outreach into one working group. Deyneko expressed GOR concerns that it might not have enough manpower to staff four new working groups. He also pressed for greater inclusion of Non-Aligned Movement Countries and for no deadlines to be imposed on the working groups. End summary.

GOR Wants Comprehensive Review

12. (SBU) Deyneko told us the GOR's main priority for the 1540 Committee was to conduct a comprehensive review of the Committee's work at set out in UNSCR 1810. He said the GOR was "upset" because the proposed comprehensive review of UNSCR 1540 has not yet happened. Deyneko told us the idea of establishing working groups should be considered by the 1540 Committee during the Comprehensive Review.

GOR Surprised, Broke Silence

13. (SBU) Deyneko told us the GOR is not opposed to USG proposals to revise the UNSC's 1540 Committee POW in principle, but he said the GOR was surprised by the ref B edits received in January. The GOR, he said, had received the U.S. proposals too late to respond to them in detail before the February 20 deadline for silence, and so decided to break silence.

GOR Concerns about the Proposed Working Groups

14. (SBU) The GOR, Deyneko said, had concerns about the proposal to establish new working groups, both because of apparent overlap and inconsistencies in the proposals and because of staffing concerns. Thus, while Moscow was essentially ready to agree to the USG-suggested changes to the POW, with the exception of Section 6,

- "Implementation of the Program of Work," the GOR would like to remove the first sentence from this section, and move the rest of the section to Annex B.
- 15. (SBU) Deyneko told us the GOR saw discrepancies in the division of labor for the working groups. In particular, the GOR wanted to know how the proposed Working Group 1, which, according to Annex B (i) would focus mostly on matrices and modalities, would differ from the existing three working groups that also focus on matrices. The GOR would also like to know how the groups would work together.
- 16. (SBU) Deyneko pointed out that Annex B (ii), first tick, which said the Assistance and Outreach working group would "encourage, and provide assistance to...all states in preparing...summary action plans" fell under the heading that this working group would monitor progress on part 3 of the Eighth Program of Work, and yet in the body of the POW, it said that this action was under part 2. The GOR also felt there was overlap between the second, third and fourth proposed working groups, since they all principally focused on outreach. Russia proposed that these three groups be merged into one. We pointed out that the different groups had different audiences and purposes, and would likely be staffed be people with different expertises.

Manpower Shortage

 \P 7. (SBU) Deyneko raised GOR concerns that the manpower might not be readily available to create the additional working groups. Each working group, he said, would require a chair, members, experts, and

MOSCOW 00000501 002 OF 002

support staff. Deyneko said that the financial crisis could make it difficult for the GOR to find enough people to staff new positions.

18. (SBU) Deyneko said the GOR was also concerned by a provision in Annex B(i) of ref B that stipulates a Monitoring and Implementation working group would "consider quantitative measures of success within the terms of resolutions 1540 (2004), 1673 (2006), and 1810 (2008)." Deyneko said this would require much cumbersome work to accomplish and was not likely produce any useful results.

Wanted: Greater Inclusion of Non-Aligned Movement

19. (SBU) Deyneko told us that Non-Alignment Movement (NAM) states have complained that the P5 largely dictates the work of UN programs. It may be necessary, he said, to expand the 1540 Committee to give NAM states a greater voice in its activities. This would make the 1540 Committee more effective and promote transparency, he argued.

No Deadlines Wanted

110. (SBU) Deyneko told us the GOR was wary to impose deadlines on the working groups. The UNSCR 1810 Committee, he argued, has a history of not meeting deadlines, and so it is unrealistic to expect the proposed Monitoring and Implementation working group to make its recommendations for revisions of matrices by June 2009, as stipulated in Annex B of ref B. He also doubted that the proposed Assistance and Outreach working group would meet its deadline of December 31, 2009. Deyneko also argued that the Committee, in some manner, should evaluate its last five years of work. We pushed back, arguing that deadlines were necessary to focus and move forward the work of the working groups.